



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,965	03/28/2001	Takao Yoshimine	275745US6	4221
22850	7590	08/11/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
CHAMPAGNE, DONALD				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3688				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/11/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,965

Applicant(s)

YOSHIMINE ET AL.

Examiner

Donald L. Champagne

Art Unit

3688

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 37-40, 48-51, 59-62, and 97-106 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 37-40, 48-51, 59-62 and 97-106 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTU-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on 17 April and 15 May 2008 have been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 37-40, 48-51, 59-62, and 97-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, for three reasons. In each of the four independent claims independent claim 37, 48, 59 and 97, the first limitation,

"receiving from a personal computer via internet, content data and predetermined information including at least category information indicating genre of the content data, to allow a user of the personal computer to self-distribute the content data;" (e.g., claim 48), is indefinite. It is not clear how receiving from a personal computer will allow a user of said PC to self-distribute from said personal computer. This is physically impossible. Once said content data is "received from" the PC it is no longer at the PC, so said content data cannot then self-distributed from the PC (because it isn't at the PC any longer). "Sending to" a personal computer would make sense in place of "receiving from" a personal computer.

4. In each of the four independent claims independent claim 37, 48, 59 and 97, the first limitation, "on demand control information" is indefinite. The spec. uses "on demand" in two contexts: "on demand type personal casting control" (spec. p. 6 description of Fig. 13) and "on demand type providing schedule control file" (spec. p. 7 description of Fig. 21). "on demand control information" is interpreted to means scheduling information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 37-39, 48-50, 59-61 and 97-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Griebenow et al. (US005850520A, hereafter Griebenow).
8. Griebenow teaches (independent claims 37, 48, 59 and 97) an apparatus, method and computer readable storage medium, the method comprising:

loading content and advertising into *storage 70* (col. 5 lines 13-16), which inherently reads on “receiving from” (interpreted as “sending to”, para. 3 above) a personal computer (*publisher’s computer 14*, col. 3 lines 24-26) via internet (col. 2 lines 56-65), content data and predetermined information including at least category information indicating genre of the content data (*bicycling*, col. 7 lines 39-41), to allow a user of the personal computer to self-distribute the content data (col. 2 lines 56-58);

receiving a request (*consumer order*, col. 3 line 65 to col. 4 line 5) from the one or more user locations (*consumer’s computer 12*) for selected content data, the request (inherently) including information specifying content data to be transmitted;

referring to on-demand control information (col. 4 lines 20-28) based on the information specifying content data to be transmitted and retrieving the selected content data (col. 4 lines 32-34);

Art Unit: 3688

transmitting, via a network, the selected content data to one or more user locations (col. 4 lines 34-45) along with a commercial (*customized advertising*) selected in accordance with the on-demand control information (col. 7 lines 21-49); and

modifying the information indicating genre (e.g., *bicycling*) of the content data through the personal computer after receiving the predetermined information (col. 6 lines 63-65 and col. 7 lines 23-49).

9. Griebenow also teaches at the citations given above claims 99-102.
10. Griebenow also teaches claims 38, 39, 49, 50, 60 and 61 (col. 10 lines 21-25); claim 98 (at the citations given above and col. 6 lines 43-58, where *web page* reads on "URL"); and claims 103-106 (col. 10 lines 58-65).
11. Claims 40, 51 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Griebenow in view of Logan et al. (US005721827A, hereafter "Logan").
12. Griebenow does not teach calculating an amount of money to be earned by the user of the personal computer for self-distributing the content data. Logan teaches calculating an amount of money to be earned by the user of the personal computer for self-distributing the content data, inherently as revenue minus total costs, including sub-steps of:
 - determine revenue equal to service user charges, where said revenue/service user charges may vary with the amount of advertising accepted by the customers/*subscribers* (col. 9 lines 5-11),
 - retrieving data representing a number of times the content data was accessed by users (the *Plays field*, col. 19 line 63 to col. 20 line 1) of the application service provider,
 - determining an amount of money (*Amount*, col. 20 lines 1-20) that corresponds to the number of times the content data was accessed by users of the application service provider, and
 - determining an adjustment to the service user charges by depending on the amount of advertising accepted by the customers/*subscribers*, by subtracting the amount of money that corresponds to the number of times the content data was accessed by users of the application service provider from the service user charges (in the formula at col. 20 line 13).

Art Unit: 3688

Under *KSR v. Teleflex* (82 USPQ 2d 1385), the combination of Logan with Griebenow would be obvious because prior art elements are being combined according to known methods to yield predictable results. It is obvious that the service provider/"user of the personal computer" would need to earn an amount of money for self-distributing the content data, and Griebenow teaches this amount of money as the *consumer bill*, but provides no details as to how said bill could be determined. Logan provides these details.

13. Neither Griebenow nor Logan teaches that the "amount of money" is determined in part by adding a connection fee of an Internet serviced provider. It would be obvious to do so when the information serviced provider/"user of the personal computer" was also providing Internet service.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed with an amendment on 17 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new basis of rejection.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L Champagne whose telephone number is 571-272-6717. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:30 AM to 8 PM ET, Monday to Thursday. The examiner can also be contacted by e-mail at donald.champagne@uspto.gov, and *informal* fax communications (i.e., communications not to be made of record) may be sent directly to the examiner at 571-273-6717.
16. The examiner's supervisor, James W. Myhre, can be reached on 571-272-6722. The fax phone number for all *formal* fax communications is 571-273-8300.
17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3688

18. **ABANDONMENT** – If examiner cannot by telephone verify applicant's intent to continue prosecution, the application is subject to abandonment six months after mailing of the last Office action. The agent, attorney or applicant point of contact is responsible for assuring that the Office has their telephone number. Agents and attorneys may verify their registration information including telephone number at the Office's web site, www.uspto.gov. At the top of the home page, click on Site Index. Then click on Agent & Attorney Roster in the alphabetic list, and search for your registration by your name or number.

1 August 2008

/Donald L. Champagne/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688